

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed October 28, 2005 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Specification

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action the Examiner stated: “The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because line 10-12 are not a complete sentence and do not appear to belong in the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b)”. Applicants have amended the abstract to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner stated, “The term “and/or” in claims 3 and 8 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite.” Applicants have amended Claims 3 and 8 and added new claims 9 and 10 to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Beyne (EP 1041624). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground for rejection.

The Examiner explained her rejection as follows:

With respect to claim 1, Beyne teaches the method of attaching a plurality of devices formed in the face of a silicon wafer with a carrier with a release layer. The silicon wafer is thinned by any conventional method and the release layer is degraded. The thinned wafer is then attached to a further target substrate by an adhesive layer. The carrier is then removed (paragraphs 0030, 0049; Figures 5A-5F).

The Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Beyne. Specifically, the Examiner states that in Beyne the release layer is degraded and the thinned wafer is thereafter attached to a further target substrate. This is incorrect. The Examiner refers to paragraphs 0030 and 0049 and Figures 5A-5F. However, nowhere in these cited portions of Beyne is there any teaching or suggestion that the release layer is degraded before the thinned wafer is attached to a target substrate. On the contrary, the teachings of Beyne are that the release layer is degraded after the thinned wafer is attached to the target substrate.

In contrast to the teachings of Beyne, Applicants' Claims 1 includes the successive steps of degradation of the glue layer followed by displacement of the element onto the target substrate. This has several advantages as explained at paragraphs [0049] – [0051] of Applicants' specification. In view of these differences from Beyne, Applicants' Claim 1 is not anticipated by Beyne.

Applicants have added new Claim 11 which specifies that the step of degradation of the adherence of the glue layer (32) is carried out before the step of displacement of the element to be transferred (12) onto the target substrate (40). Applicants' new Claim 1 is not anticipated by Beyne since Beyne does not teach or suggest the claimed order of steps.

Applicants have added new Claim 12 which specifies that the step of degradation of the adherence of the glue layer (32) causes a modification of the mechanical hold compatible with ulterior separation. Basis for this claim can be found e.g. at page 3, lines 19-20 of the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Beyne in view of Rayssac et al. The Applicants traverse this ground for rejection. As explained above Beyne does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed successive steps of degradation of the glue layer followed by displacement of the element onto the target substrate. The Rayssac et al. reference does not teach these successive steps either. Accordingly Applicants' claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP



Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Dated: 3/28/06

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040